

Table of Contents

Preface

Why Continue Existing? I

Response to Objections

Conclusion of Argumentation

Why Reproduce?

Why Continue Existing? II

Regarding the structure of this book I've placed the most radical argument against the perpetuation of life at the very beginning because I feel as though it is most fundamental to understanding my perspective. However if you want to read the least radical arguments first and most radical last simply read the chapters in reverse order.

Preface

I've never seen the beauty of nature and I've never been capable of understanding the perspective of people who do. I've only ever seen the brutality of organisms consuming one another and an uncaring "*mother nature*" bearing witness to, serving as the field for and adding to the agonies of her progeny.

I acknowledge that there are many beautiful sights and sounds to be found in nature but nature in toto never seemed beautiful to me. Just as there are many beautiful sights and sounds within New York, New York though New York is on balance a filthy, ugly and brutal hellscape.

Sunshine, roses and rainbows don't outweigh the maggots feasting upon corpses, the horribly disfigured animals barely eeking out an existence or the harshness of the conditions most animals face from "*beautiful mother nature*" such as temperature extremes and cataclysmic events such as volcanic eruptions, storms, quakes etc. The shiny lights, music and games of Las Vegas don't make up for the predation and exploitation of humans by humans.

No part of our world is on balance beautiful in my eyes. Every corner of our world is full of suffering. The natural world is indescribably brutal and predatory whereas the human world (which will always be a part of and can never be separated from the natural world in spite of our best efforts) is best described as disgustingly parasitic. The natural world, the wild, is characterized by poorly sapient yet highly sentient (i.e. capable of experiencing pleasure and pain) beings tearing one another apart in order to continue their existence. Humans on the other hand have perfected the breeding and mass slaughter of animals to gratify their wants. Human society in general is best described as the parasitic exploitation of worker by capitalist and of helpless animals by the carnivorous masses.

Human society is characterized by covert predation (exploitation) whereas in the wild the prey are aware of their adversaries and their intentions. We raise animals, torture them and then kill them without those animals being aware of our ultimate intentions for them until they reach the slaughterhouse. Then there's the exploitation of the working classes by the ruling classes throughout the entirety of civilized human history; the exploitation of slaves by their owners, of peasants by nobles and of the proletariat by the capitalists.

I say all this not as the starting point for a thorough critique of capitalism or carnivorism but merely to expose my perspective. Wherever I look I see pain and I'm unconvinced that anything can be done to alter that short of extinguishing all sentient life.

However before we get into why I'm convinced that we should extinguish all sentient life I'll just give a bit more information about myself. For reasons of which I'm unaware I've always felt alone, in fact one of the earliest memories I can recall is of preferring to be alone as a bunch of kids from my neighborhood were out playing, I believe it was in the fall. I can't recall why I preferred to be alone even at such an early age but I can only presume that it was for the same reason I would prefer to be alone later in life and which holds true now; I fail to relate to other people, due primarily to their optimistic perspective.

It's hard to recall mental states from your youth especially when you're so far removed from them but I know I was depressed at an early age and I know that in my youth I've had, at least in passing, many of the thoughts which I now consciously reflect upon and relay within this work. I've always been a dour person, I've always been what most would colloquially refer to as a pessimist and not long after my 26th birthday I realized that I have no reason to accept that there is a supernatural aspect to our reality; consequently I became a thorough, philosophical, pessimist.

I could trace my intellectual development in this work but that'd be pointless and tedious. I also won't present well-grounded arguments in favor of atheism, marxism or veganism as there are plenty of works which have already done so probably far more capably than I could.

I'll just briefly state that I'm an atheist because I became convinced (by the Testament by French catholic priest and atheist Jean Meslier) that there aren't any convincing arguments in favor of the supernatural and that gods (as typically conceived) are logically impossible. Further I realized that all of the evidence in favor of a supernatural aspect to our reality was either fabricated, distorted or inconclusive.

I accept the arguments of Marx and Engels about the development of human society as true because I've read many of their works and understand how their perspective accurately portrays reality. I believe that most people would accept their arguments if they familiarized themselves with said arguments and I've only ever rejected them in ignorance.

I no longer purchase animal products because I've got empathy for other sentient beings and it really is that simple. I don't want any responsibility for the suffering of other beings capable of experiencing pain, especially when there's no necessity for me to do so. Humans are perfectly capable of subsisting exclusively upon plants and fungi; our carnivory is just a product of tradition and addiction to either the texture or the taste of meat both of which can now be adequately replicated by plant and fungal substitutes.

If you're incapable of empathizing with other animals I don't know what to tell you but if you imagine that humans deserve to slaughter and consume animals because we're more sapient than they are by that logic we may as well consume mentally retarded humans as well.

When it comes to the existence of a supernatural aspect to reality few people move beyond blind

acceptance of the faith into which they were indoctrinated typically by or at the behest of their parents. Few people contemplate how and why our society developed as it did and almost no one reads what Marx and Engels wrote, especially those who are critical of their position. Few people really consider the ethics of torturing and slaughtering other sentient beings to fulfill their unnecessary wants.

It's easy to be ignorant and go through life without considering for what reason you believe x or commit x action. It's easy to thoughtlessly conform to the norm. I'm not out to condemn or guilt-trip anyone into accepting anything, this is merely an entreaty for contemplation upon positions most fail to give the consideration due them given their import.

If you're a creationist I encourage you to familiarize yourself with the facts of evolution, especially endogenous retroviruses.

If you're not already a marxist I'd encourage you to read the writings of Marx and Engels, especially Engels as his writings are quite a bit easier to grasp.

If you're not already a vegan I'd encourage you to visit or watch some slaughterhouse footage and to ask yourself if you'd like to be treated in the same manner if you were of lesser intelligence. If you lack empathy altogether and aren't concerned with the future of humanity then you're immunized against all arguments for veganism.

You don't need to be a marxist or have empathy for animals to understand my perspective upon many issues but if you're a theist or hold other supernatural beliefs you probably won't seriously consider anything I've got to say so this work is probably a waste of your time.

Why Continue Existing? I

This is a topic upon which I'm going to touch twice, firstly as regards living beings in general and secondly as regards myself.

There aren't any rational justifications for continuing your life just as there aren't any justifications for humans consuming meat. All lives end and taking a more far-reaching view we know that inevitably all life throughout the cosmos will be terminated probably long before the cosmos reach a big crunch state or go through a big rip or heat death or whatever will eventually transpire. Though we may be ignorant of the exact fate in store for the cosmos we can rest assured that it won't be habitable in perpetuity. After all only a tiny portion of our own homeworld is even habitable to us right now so it's delusional to imagine that life will be eternally possible.

No action you take has true permanence. Everything will wither away and our planet will probably fall into our star in about 7 billion or so years. Long before that though sol 3, Earth, will become too hot to sustain even microbial life, current maximal estimates say that our world will reach that state within about 2.8 billion years.

Tectonic action will render sol 3 uninhabitable for mammalian life at some point in the future, probably in about 250 million years. Meteors could also kill all humans or at least set in motion a sequence of events which directly causes or at least hastens our extinction. Of course all of these future causes for our extinction are only relevant if we somehow prevent our self-destruction which seems unlikely.

Irrespective of how things eventually unfold all life will inevitably be extinguished. To reiterate, nothing

possesses any true permanence. So any goal you want to establish for yourself or for your family or for humanity collectively is futile. Everything you do will be undone by natural forces if not by other people; you're not capable of accomplishing anything.

So reproduction is a very ignorant and futile reason to continue your existence, you're a genetic dead-end irrespective of whether or not you reproduce. Reproduction is a burden and offers only pleasant neurological states as a reward. People reproduce for their own gratification; reproduction is selfish, but we'll return to this topic later.

Achieving long-term goals in order to see our species and its descendant species propagate indefinitely are pointless and extinguishing our species for the sake of other species is just as pointless for the aforesaid reason.

The only goals really worthy of pursuit are those which enrich your own life. Pleasure is the cheese the mice are chasing, enjoyment is the primary reason people will consciously give for perpetuating their existence. People want to enjoy a good life, they want to enjoy the fruits of their labor. We crave enjoyment primarily through novel experiences and activities which we subjectively determine to be meaningful in spite of the ultimate and objective meaninglessness and pointlessness of any action we may take.

Pleasure is at least a sensible goal, enjoyment is the only seemingly plausible reason to continue existing given the facts. However, for the intelligent especially, life is so agonizingly boring and exhausting that even if you've the good fortune to be born into a capitalist family you're liable to tire of life.

The privileged proletariat of western nations have to waste at least half of their life in bed, at work and on the road to sustain their miserable lives and if they die before they're able to retire they've

definitely burned up more than half of their lives on this garbage. Assuming you've survived to a retirement age you're almost certainly already crippled and senile or on the verge of death from cancer or some other ailment. So you'll waste more than half your life to finance your gradual decline and possibly enjoy a tiny bit of your final years now that your body has thoroughly deteriorated.

If you're not within a western nation your life is really hell but I won't get into it because the people who do care should already be aware and those who don't won't appreciate me wasting their time crying about the plight of people for which they're unconcerned.

However for those of you who do have strong empathy for others you definitely shouldn't bring children into being, most especially within impoverished nations. If you're genuinely interested in the welfare of others then Benatar's asymmetry should suffice to convince you not to reproduce and personally I feel that it's also a great argument against continuing life.

Benatar's asymmetry is that non-existence is preferable to existence because those who don't exist never suffer nor are they deprived of enjoyment. If someone wants to argue that those who don't exist are deprived of anything by virtue of their not coming into being then by that logic we should lament the failure of every spermatozoon to fertilize an egg but we don't because no one strongly values prospective life. We only really begin considering the possible future of an organism once an egg has been fertilized and most people (other than the parents who value said potential life from conception and in any event this is true only if they intend to reproduce) only begin to value a potential human once the fetus is at least several months old.

No one is deprived of anything by not having been conceived and birthed. Your existence begins with conception but your awareness of yourself begins in

most cases only 3 or so years after birth and even then you're not who you are today.

Personhood is hard to define in spite of what theists want to tell you, really it's just anthropocentric dribble anyway but if we are going to take it seriously we need to acknowledge that many of us aren't even remotely as we were even a year ago. Personally I don't identify with and can't really imagine how I held the perspective I held even in 2020 but I don't care enough to get into the philosophical weeds upon something so abstract as personhood. Suffice it to say that a child is not the same as the adult they'll become and no one is the same at 30 as they were at 20 and so on and so forth; so it's a bit preposterous to invent the concept of personhood, which is simply a justification for placing ourselves above other animals, when plenty of humans aren't more intelligent than dolphins or octopi and when humans aren't really that special cognitively. Certainly we're more intelligent than other animals on average but we're just reaction machines as they are, there's no more consistency or continuity in the thoughts and opinions of man than there are in the feelings of any other animal. The mind is a myth and the brain is constantly being stimulated, there is no spiritual "you" above, beyond or outside of time. Everything about your "*state of mind*" is a product of past and present circumstances. You don't exist as you imagine you do; you're a product of your inherited genetics, your past experiences and your present conditions.

Nothing is inherently valuable and we've no reason to value the lives of others on account of the species to which they belong. Humans aren't unique or special because we're more intelligent. The respects in which we're superior to other animals do not in and of themselves justify procreation.

Let's return to the value of the asymmetry argument as regards existing beings instead of continuing the anti-natalist arguments which are deserving of their

own section. Benatar argues that to end, even painlessly, the life of an existing being is harmful because that being has goals; to which I would respond that that is a preposterous argument.

If a life can be painlessly terminated without them being aware then they don't experience any pain or suffering. In this scenario they could only potentially suffer if they were somehow capable of lamenting the fact that they failed to complete their plans. However no such possibility exists so ending a life is perfectly justifiable if we accept that life is inherently agonizing which I'll now establish.

No one inherently values their existence, we all value the existence we have or at least value existence due to the possibility of leading a mostly pleasurable life. There is an inherited desire to persist in spite of leading even the most deprived existence imaginable but that's a separate issue as here I'm talking only about what we consciously value.

Almost no one would consciously value an entire lifetime in prison or as a slave or within a dungeon being subjected to torture. So we consciously value our lives for the pleasurable experiences we actually receive and or anticipate. Pleasure is the cheese the mice are chasing, it is the reason we'll consciously give for continuing our lives in spite of all the suffering we endure.

If our lives are truly mostly agonizing why then do we continue them if we're after satisfying experiences? Quite simply it is because we're the products of two billion years of selective pressure in favor of a will to persist (even single-celled organisms flee from predation) in spite of all the torments inflicted upon us. We irrationally and unconsciously continue in spite of how harsh our lives are and even conscious acknowledgment that we're better off not existing (as we're then incapable of experiencing pain and

suffering) is insufficient to overcome our inherited, naturally selected unconscious programming to live.

Existence in and of itself has nothing to offer, no one would enjoy a life in which they sat within an empty room consuming tasteless food and drink, excreting waste and respiring. All of the "*good things*" in life are in essence merely either the alleviation of pain or of boredom which can absolutely be described as a form of suffering. All of the little pass-times and games we've invented serve simply to alleviate the boredom which exists for us now that we've engineered solutions for the most serious problems which threatened our survival and kept us stimulated.

Our highly developed problem-solving brains can't tolerate a lack of stimulation so existence becomes less bearable as we eliminate problems. This is true for all of the more intelligent organisms, they'll gradually tire of life if they're not properly stimulated, if they're not challenged to solve something.

Misery is the default state and pleasure is something we're obliged to uncover thus the origination of the term "*pleasure seeking*" because it isn't freely available as life isn't inherently enjoyable, especially for highly cognizant beings. We're obliged to extract pleasure from something even if it's only delusional fantasies cooked up in order to satisfy ourselves. Humans aren't capable of being satisfied without stimuli as a plant can function perfectly fine without any neurons. Pleasure is the effect of particular neurological states which are produced in response to certain stimuli. Which particular stimuli happen to induce pleasure and with what intensity that pleasure is experienced differs from person to person.

As I said misery (from boredom) is the default state of a brain existing within a sensual void. Of course sensual voids don't exist but there's nothing inherently pleasurable about our reality even if it is stimulating enough to stave off boredom. Terror about

the immediate situation and fear for the future, though stimulating, obviously aren't an improvement upon boredom for most people. Our modern existence though far from a sensual void is still quite bland for myself and many others. Many of the little garbage games and distractions we've developed to keep ourselves interested in life are terribly unappealing to myself and many others. I couldn't care less to go boating or fishing or hiking or sight-seeing or gambling or drinking etc. I feel that boredom is probably one of the primary drivers of suicide. Prolonged boredom can really deteriorate your brain.

People may disagree with me when I say that life is inherently uninteresting but I don't feel that anyone can show that happiness is anything but the alleviation of boredom which I argue is the default state of the existence of a highly intelligent organism. The manner in which our brains have evolved to function means that we're in agony if we're not stimulated; so yes, boredom, which results in depression if it's intense and prolonged enough, is the default.

Response to Objections

Before I continue expounding my position I feel it's important to take a moment to respond to some objections to what I've said thus far.

Firstly optimists will say that just because extinction is an inevitability it doesn't follow that we shouldn't do x or y to improve our lives. That's a bit of a mischaracterization of my position. If one is determined to continue existing it's sensible for them to do things to improve the conditions of their existence. I'm merely pointing out the ultimate futility of any long-term project and advocating for people to improve exclusively their own living conditions without regard for the distant future. As an

anti-natalist I would say that we shouldn't even worry about the living standards of future generations and as an efilist I believe we should plan to terminate all sentient life upon the Earth but we'll get to those arguments later.

Suffice it to say that acknowledging the ultimate futility of any action you take doesn't preclude you from taking action to minimize the suffering within your own life; on the contrary I'd say that such an acknowledgment should compel you to focus solely upon yourself. So no I'd never dissuade someone from taking steps to improve their lot in life. Though I believe life to be worse than death working towards the improvement of your life is more sensible than working towards the improvement of the lives of future generations whose existence is as unnecessary, unjustifiable and hazard fraught as our own.

The strongly empathetic will take exception to my claim that the only goal worthy of pursuit is experiencing pleasure. The strongly empathetic will say that improving the lives of other even at cost to yourself is worthwhile but I'm writing from my perspective and I don't much care about the suffering of others, especially when it isn't immediately before me. That may be terrible but for me it's true. I'm not totally devoid of empathy but I don't care enough to expend time or energy to assist others, especially strangers. I don't want others to suffer but I'm not going to place a grievous burden upon myself in order to prevent the suffering of others. So to me it's an objection without value.

Furthermore the brains of the strongly empathetic are configured in such a way that sacrifice for the benefit of others is itself a pleasurable experience so in no way does their example contradict my argument.

Optimists will say that your life might become great, there's no reason to end it. I'm unconcerned with what may be I'm concerned with what already is and what's

most likely given what I know about the past and present. I know with near certainty that I'm going to be compelled to labor for several more decades and that I may not even be capable of saving enough money to retire before I'm in such poor health that I'll regret not having ended my life before then. These statements are true for most of the proletariat irrespective of whether they're inclined to see the truth or deny it.

No one should concern themselves with the possibility of winning the lottery, maintaining near perfect neurological health until they expire, passing peacefully in their sleep, enjoying their final years etc. These are all statistically unlikely pipe dreams and you should expect financial ruin from financing your medical care in old age, cognitive decline, agonizing pain before death or boredom at best in the final years of your existence.

Conclusion of Argumentation

Fundamentally I don't feel that people should perpetuate their suffering without a good reason to do so. People may consciously suspect and believe that their lives are enjoyable and worthy of experiencing but as shown earlier this bias (known as the existence bias in philosophical circles) is an unconscious product of evolution, it is an irrational and inherited desire.

No one wants to experience the suffering they tolerate to get their next hit of dopamine or serotonin but they do so because they've been naturally selected to do so. Consciously almost no one would agree to experience ten minutes of the most excruciating pain for thirty minutes of the most intense pleasure.

So the only somewhat sensible reason to persist is merely the alleviation of agony (agony which can be completely negated by ending your existence) and the

alleviation is too weak and infrequent for many people to be truly satisfied with life anyway. To word it more plainly people continue their lives to solve a problem which exists only as a consequence of life. No one would experience pain or boredom if they didn't live yet we continue our lives in order to experience neurological states which are induced through stimulation. To reiterate we only experience pleasure, our brains are only wired to reward us for seeking particular forms of stimulation, because it is a nature-made means of ensuring our replication. The pleasure you receive from an apple really is just a product of emergent complexity, it's just a product of biological organisms developing a reward system through natural selection to ensure that these organisms are more likely to propagate themselves. So the boredom you're experiencing is just you being punished by neurological systems over which you've no control because you're not engaged in activity which properly stimulates you. So your entire existence is really just chasing meaningless garbage to stave off punishment.

As a final argument I'm going to expound the efilist position that we should end the existence of all sentient life upon our planet. This argument won't hold much water for those who are unconcerned with the suffering of others but then again that goes for many sections of this book.

Efilism is the term for the philosophical position that life is inherently harmful and that we, as highly sapient beings, have an obligation to eliminate sentient life in order to permanently eliminate pain and suffering. The term efil is life spelled backwards and it was coined by efilism's chief proponent Gary Mosher. Gary argues against suicide saying that efilists should continue their lives in order to convince people that our perspective is correct so that we may (as a species) implement a permanent solution and thus eliminate all future suffering upon the Earth.

While I admire Gary's brilliance as a philosopher I don't believe that the achievement of any goal is sufficient justification for perpetuating your existence, especially since said goal is motivated by empathetic sentiments which are themselves merely a product of evolution.

Caveats aside let's get into it. The efilist perspective is quite simple to grasp in it's fundamentals. Non-existence is in no way harmful as being deprived of pleasure isn't a harm. Life is inherently harmful (as it is the sole arena for experiencing pain and sorrow) and should be eliminated in order to prevent future pain and suffering. Other Animals, especially other fish (humans are terrestrial fish, tetrapods, for those who are somehow unaware of that fact) are equipped to experience pain and so we should eliminate them in addition to ourselves in order to bring about a permanent end to suffering upon the Earth.

Nature is inextricably replete with pain and suffering and we have no means to permanently end pain and suffering aside from extinguishing sentient life. The wild is obviously just indescribably horrific but even human society is inextricably replete with suffering. Assuming we're capable of excising exploitation of man by man through the utilization of technology which enables machines to complete all necessary work we still face the problem of boredom. More realistically though the exploitation and suffering of the impoverished for the benefit of the wealthy and of the non-western peoples for the benefit of westerners will continue. Countless people have been seriously injured or killed so that we can enjoy the benefits of an advanced industrial society as of the 19th century.

As Gary Mosher puts it life is just **Consumption, Reproduction, Addiction and Parasitism. C.R.A.P.** You're just pointlessly consuming, reproducing and exploiting (whether you're aware of it or intend to do so or not)

other sentient beings because of your irrational, programmed and inherited addiction to existence.

C.R.A.P. is really the perfect summation of life and it's equally true for all other organisms they're simply too dumb to be aware of their condition or even be made aware of it.

Life is inherently unethical as it necessitates mass murder and exploitation in order to sustain. Non-human animal life is especially subject to this fact. The vast majority of non-human animals are brutalized and consumed by predators before they reach adulthood. Humans slaughter innumerable animals in order to satisfy their addiction to animal products. Humans are at least capable of minimizing the harm we inflict upon sentient beings though not of eliminating it as even simply shipping wares through the seas, wind and solar power generation, oil drilling etc. all exact a significant cost in animal lives and suffering. However obligate carnivores are obviously incapable of doing anything to minimize the suffering for which they're responsible. If we eliminate just humanity then suffering will continue for however long Earth can sustain life with nociceptors.

In short, life is pointless and harmful, death is the solution to all of our problems and these problems exist only because we're alive.

Personally I am in total agreement with the efilist perspective but it may well be quite a while before it becomes mainstream and quite frankly it may never be widely accepted.

Why Reproduce?

Many of the arguments against continuing life could also be made against procreation. Essentially there's just no point in creating a new being. It accomplishes nothing and it's a drain upon your own resources.

The most common reasons for procreating are delusional and selfish. Firstly people reproduce in order to continue their bloodline which is a futile endeavor as all species are doomed to extinction. Procreating for the sake of ensuring the continuity of your genes is also delusional in that your distant descendants won't share much genetic information with you in any event. Even your grandchildren haven't inherited a full quarter of their genes from you due to mutations. All organisms possess an unconscious desire to procreate as a product of evolutionary history but mankind also possesses a conscious reason to procreate; the desire to achieve immortality in some respect. As stated earlier all life will inevitably cease so this yearning for immortality is foolish.

People also reproduce in the hopes that their offspring will look after them in their old age. There really isn't a more selfish reason to procreate yet many do so for this very reason. In a lot of cases I believe this reason to be merely a post-hoc rationalization for their irrational decision to procreate; and I believe it to be merely a post-hoc rationalization because the expenses incurred by raising children to adulthood are seldom recuperated even assuming that your offspring do assist you or even completely finance your existence in your final years. The money you spent raising children could be invested in any number of ways to better secure your comfortable existence in your final years.

Investing in offspring as a retirement plan assumes that your children survive into adulthood, that they care enough about you to be inclined to assist you and

that they're physically and or financially capable of assisting you. You're assuming three huge risks over which you've little control. It's a foolish retirement plan and few people who reproduce do so for this reason but it is something that they contemplate after the deed is done. It's one of a number of factors that justify their thoughtless and irrational choice to procreate.

People will say that they chose to reproduce in order to make the world a better place by raising a role-model citizen who does x, y and z to save humanity. It's just really hilarious that some people can fool themselves into imagining that they're capable of raising someone who will be so important and have such an impact. Firstly I would say that individuals are of no import. Secondly it's amusing that people (especially uninteresting people) convince themselves that they're capable of molding their offspring into world-leaders or successful activists or whatever. Thirdly it's pretty funny that we've got so many people who trick themselves into thinking that anything that they (or their offspring) do won't be undone in the short-term by people with opposing goals.

To go into greater depth we'll skip over my assertion that individuals aren't of much importance because I don't care enough to try to convince people otherwise, if you want to believe that individuals are extremely important, if you want to cling to the great man theory of history then whatever.

It's pretty funny that uninteresting people imagine that they're going to raise some ground-breaking, trailblazing children by doing a, b and c and that this child will dramatically improve the lives of others. As if run-of-the-mill wage-slaves are capable of intentionally structuring the lives of their offspring in order for them to become extraordinary. Doing everything within your power to facilitate the development of your children into influential, positive

and hardworking adults doesn't guarantee that they'll become anything but monsters. Plenty of serial killers, rapists, arsonists etc. had great upbringings that should've molded them into people who are at least locally renowned for their positive impact upon society. Working class people who imagine that they've got the resources and ability to raise children who will be a greater benefit to humanity than they are are telling themselves a nice little bedtime story about their children whose future no one can foresee. If there were a child who cured cancer for every million parents who have justified procreation with "*well my child might discover the cure for cancer*" then cancer would've been cured decades ago.

The excuses people invent to justify their irresponsible and thoughtless actions are absurd. Everyone hopes that their children will "*do better*" or "*be better off*" than they were but that's atypical. If every generation "*did better*" than the previous one we wouldn't face the same problems in perpetuity. The resource distribution issues can potentially be solved in the future, humanity could potentially live within a post-scarcity world but we won't eliminate all of the neurological "*defects*" responsible for violent behavior for a long time.

Assuming we're capable of resolving all of our issues (including boredom) you still have to ask the fundamental question which is to what end? Why bother with any of it? What is our end goal? Why reproduce? I'll get into these momentarily but I want to briefly touch upon the third point I raised earlier.

For this argument we don't even need to raise the issue of how other people might raise their children who will counteract the efforts of your children who you've inculcated with whatever value-set. We can just bring up children who are in total opposition to their parents. I'm a total failure from my parent's perspective. As of my writing this they're christian, conservative carnivores. I don't share really any

values with either of them so I'm a great example of your efforts being counteracted. Your efforts to create a child who goes out into the world and accomplishes x in the name of y cause might be completely pointless and you may even be raising a child who goes against everything for which you stand.

No one can really articulate a good reason to reproduce. It always boils down to bullshit like "*well I want people to experience the joys of this world*" which is just laden with assumptions about someone's quality of life which is subjectively determined anyway. The standards you've got for a good life or even a merely tolerable life probably aren't the same as the standards you've had in the past or will have in the future and they're almost certainly not going to align with those of your child/children. Then of course there's the very real possibility that your child/children could be horrifically deformed, raped, tortured or simply incapable of being happy due to neurological defects.

Anyway if the goal of reproduction is to induce pleasant neurological states we could just grow brains in vats and stimulate them with electrodes. In fact if that's our conscious goal as a species we may as well grow as many brains as possible and do everything within our power to stimulate them as strongly as possible for as long as possible. Brains in vats stimulated by electrodes don't have to experience anything painful either so it's an improvement over rearing countless humans whose lives are largely agonizing. It's also far most cost effective because we're not sustaining an entire body with all of it's flesh and countless microorganisms we're just keeping a brain alive. So if you're truly interested in maximizing happiness you should be totally on board with the brains in vats stimulated by electrodes proposition.

Some might try to counter the aforesaid with "*but my experiences are unique and can't be replicated by electrodes*" to which I'd respond you're just ignorantly assuming that your experiences are qualitatively different from those created by electrical stimulation probably because you're still egoistically tied to the spiritualist notion that man is more than a biological machine. No you're really not anything more than a biological machine and no there isn't anything special about the neurological stimulation you receive "*naturally*" viz-a-viz that induced through electricity.

The final argument I really want to touch is upon is that reproducing makes the parents happy and that makes it all okay to recklessly bring someone into the world.

I haven't addressed theistic garbage much because it's undeserving of anyone's time really but I just want to throw this out there; if you believe that there is a possibility of eternal torment for any percentage of an unknown number of your descendants isn't reproducing the most evil thing you can do? You're really willing to potentially condemn an unknown number of people to eternal torment because you wanted to orgasm? Hilarious.

Anyway choosing to reproduce because it makes you happy is really the most stupid and short-sighted excuse you could concoct for procreation. Plenty of people do it though, they'll reproduce in order to get on better terms with their partner. They'll reproduce to have something to do or someone to control etc. It's all ridiculous and disgusting. If it's fine for one person to suffer so that another can be happy then there's really nothing wrong with slavery or torture.

Why Continue Existing? II

There aren't any reasons to continue my life just as there aren't any reasons for anyone to continue theirs. If I could press a button and painlessly expire I would but unfortunately whatever process I would go through to end my existence would probably be agonizing.

Assuming I survive another 50 years and am ill about 3 times per year for about 3 days each time I've got about an entire year of being ill ahead of me. I really hate being alive when I'm ill and I don't look forward to the future. Then of course there's always a good chance that I'll develop cancer, dementia or some other horrific and permanent ailment or disability that ruins my quality of life.

Probably the smartest thing to do would be to end the nightmare today but I'll probably hold out until they legalize assisted suicide where I live or until some foreign nation legalizes assisted suicide for tourists. I can tolerate life for a while as it is now but I'm very cognizant of how horrific life becomes with age and I'd rather kill myself at 50 or 60 than live to 70 as a senile creep and become incapable of anything let alone of ending my agony.

People will say well if you kill yourself at 50 or 60 you won't get to enjoy your golden years, your retirement, as if slowly rotting until you collapse is any fuckin fun and as if my life was ever enjoyable anyway. My entire life has been shit so I'm not worried about enjoying some delusional fantasy golden years.

Really I'm just trying to grit and bear this garbage existence until it becomes completely intolerable so I won't have to worry about anyone bitching after I choose to end it.

No I don't have any good reason to continue, yes I'm irrational, yes I'm in pain, no I'm not satisfied with really any aspect of my life but oh well fuck it.